



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/728,097

12/05/2003

Hyun-kwon Chung

1793.1113

7294

49455 7590 08/13/2008

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP  
1400 EYE STREET, NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/13/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



### DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 04/22/2008. This action is made **Final**.
- B. Claims 1-14 remain pending.
- C. Claim rejection under 35 USC 101 has been withdrawn due to amendment to specification.
- 

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dang, Nga T. (US 7,216,300 B2), herein referred to as “Dang”.

***As for independent claim 1***, Dang teaches a method of executing markup document applet by a browser, comprising: receiving a request for executing an applet from the browser (col.2, lines 17-23); determining whether the applet is a bound applet or an

Art Unit: 2179

unbound applet (col.2, lines 49-52); loading the requested applet into a virtual machine; and if the applet is an unbound applet (col.3, lines 19-22), immediately issuing predetermined commands to the virtual machine to first set the unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state, respectively (figure 4; col.1, lines 17-30; col.3, line 2).

As for dependent claim 2, Dang teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: if the unbound applet is completed, issuing predetermined commands to the virtual machine to set the unbound applet into a stop state and into a destroy state, respectively (figure 4; col.4, lines 56-67).

As for dependent claim 3, Dang teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: if determined that the applet is a bound applet and determined by the browser that a markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure, issuing a predetermined command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into an initiate state (figure 4; col.4, lines 46-48).

As for dependent claim 4, Dang teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising: issuing a command to the virtual machine each time the markup document is displayed to set the bound applet into a start state while the markup document is being rendered by the browser; if the markup document is unloaded by the browser, issuing a command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into a stop state; and issuing a command

Art Unit: 2179

to the virtual machine to set the applet into a destroy state to delete the bound applet (figure 4; col.4, lines 49-67).

***As for independent claim 5***, Dang teaches an apparatus executing a markup document applet, comprising: a memory which stores an input markup document (col.3, lines 12-18); a virtual machine which executes an applet related to the markup document (col.3, lines 14-22); a browser which receives the markup document from the memory and outputs information on an applet related to the markup document included in the markup document (col.3, lines 23-37); and an application manager which receives the applet information from the browser, retrieves the applet from an external data source, controls the retrieved applet to be stored in the memory, receives a request for executing the stored applet, loads the stored applet into the virtual machine, determines whether the loaded applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet, and if the loaded applet is an unbound applet, immediately issues predetermined commands to the virtual machine to first set the loaded unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state, respectively (col.3, lines 5-67 and col.4, lines 11-37).

As for dependent claim 6, Dang teaches the apparatus of claim 5, wherein when the virtual machine informs the application manager that the unbound applet is completed, and the application manager issues a command to the virtual machine to set the unbound applet into a stop state and issues another command to the virtual machine to set the unbound applet into a destroy state to unload the unbound applet from the

virtual machine (col.4, lines 56-67).

As for dependent claim 7, Dang teaches the apparatus of claim 5, wherein if the applet is a bound applet, the browser informs the application manager that the markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure, and the application manager issues a command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into an initiate state (col.4, lines 46-48).

As for dependent claim 8, Dang teaches the apparatus of claim 7, wherein the application manager further: issues a command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into a start state while the markup document is being rendered by the browser, issues another command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into stop state, if the markup document is unloaded by the browser, repeatedly issues the initiate and stop commands to the virtual machine to start and stop the bound applet upon redisplaying the markup document by the browser, and issues a command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into a destroy state to unload the bound applet from the virtual machine (col.4, lines 49-67).

***As for independent claim 9***, Dang teaches a computer-readable recording medium storing at least one program controlling an interactive contents reproduction apparatus to execute a markup applet according to a process comprising: receiving a request for executing an applet from the browser (col.2, lines 17-23); determining whether the

Art Unit: 2179

requested applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet (col.2, lines 49-52); loading the requested applet into a virtual machine (col.3, lines 19-22); and if the requested applet is an unbound applet, immediately issuing predetermined commands to the virtual machine to first set the requested loaded unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state, respectively (figure 4; col.1, lines 17-30 and col.3, line 2).

***As for independent claim 10***, Dang teaches an interactive digital versatile disc (DVD) player, comprising: a programmed computer processor controlling the player according to a process (col.3, lines 12-13) comprising: processing a markup document classifying tagged applets into bound and unbound applets to display interactive contents (col.3, lines 19-32), determining whether an applet execution of the markup document is a bound applet or an unbound applet according to the classifying, and if the applet is an unbound applet, launching the unbound applet by immediately issuing predetermined commands to first set the unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state, respectively (col.3, lines 46-67; figures 2-4).

As for dependent claim 11, Dang teaches the player of claim 10, wherein the programmed computer processor launches the unbound applet without synchronization with the markup document processing (col.2, lines 49-52; executing applet without markup document processing).

As for dependent claim 12, Dang teaches the player of claim 10, wherein the launched

Art Unit: 2179

unbound applet continuously executes independent of the markup document processing (col.2, lines 49-52).

**As for independent claim 13**, Dang teaches a method, comprising: classifying tagged applets of a markup document; and controlling different execution life cycles of the tagged applets according to the classifying (figure 4; col.4, lines 46-67; note the analysis of claim 1 above).

As for dependent claim 14, Dang teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the classifying comprises classifying the tagged applets into bound and unbound applets, and wherein according to the controlling, execution life cycle of a bound applet depends on the markup document life, and the execution life cycle of an unbound applet is independent of the markup document life (figure 4; col.4, lines 46-67; col.2, lines 49-52; wherein applet executes without markup document processing).

---

**(Note:)** It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 04/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.



After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues that Dang does not teach a determination of whether an applet is a bound applet or unbound applet. Also that Dang's applets are initiated without classification.

R1. Examiner does not agree.

Applicant's definition of bound and unbound applet:

"A bound applet indicates a conventional applet. In other words, the bound applet is defined by a predetermined tag of a markup document and is highly dependent on the markup document. In contrast to the bound applet, an unbound applet executes independent of a corresponding markup document" (emphasis added) (par.41 of specification).

Dang provides a determination when the user is interacting with the system, in such a determination is present in order for the system to render the desired information. Dang shows that there are bond and unbound applets (as admitted by Applicant) and when the user navigates to another site applets determined to be unbound to keep executing while the user opens new applets that are bound (col.4, lines 11-37). Thus it is evident that since Dang shows a system that can keep track of and execute a plurality of applets there is a determination of what state a current applet is in and whether that applet is either bound or unbound at a given time as the user

navigates through an interface. Dang's system uses a Frame class to manage all of the applets a user is currently executing on a system, thus Dang provides a system wherein initiated applets have a classification (where or not an applet is within a frame and whether to have associated window classes; col.3, lines 45-67 and col.4, lines 1-9).

A2. Applicant argues that Dang does not teach the limitation in claim 3 and 7; "determined by the browser that a markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure, issuing a predetermined command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into an initiate state" and "the browser informs the application manager that the markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure".

R2. Examiner does not agree, Dang teaches that the system uses Java computer language's Abstract Window Toolkit which is used for creation of WebPages and anything that would make uses of a graphical user interface. The AWT code is a grammatical structure that is read. Dang teaches that the system executes a plurality of Java coded pages within the system and makes determination of when and if pages are initialized. If the pages are being read, then it was determined that the grammatical structure is correct or else it would fail to read and the system would never be able to initialize an applet; thus since Dang shows that coded applets using code languages are being initialized by the system it is evident that the system is reading a grammatically correct structured document or else the applets would fail to initialize. Therefore it is true that Dang teaches determined by the browser that a markup document connected to the

bound applet has a grammatically correct structure, issuing a predetermined command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into an initiate state and the browser informs the application manager that the markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure (col.2, lines 16-42; col.5, lines 4-40).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Inquires***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

Art Unit: 2179

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2179  
August 1, 2008

/Ba Huynh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179